



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231

SERIAL NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
07/800,364	11/26/91	HEWICK	R 5182A

LEGAL AFFAIRS DEPT.
GENETICS INSTITUTE, INC.
87 CAMBRIDGE PARK DR.
CAMBRIDGE, MA 02140

18M2/1108

FURNAMER	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1814	25-23

DATE MAILED:

11/08/94

Below is a communication from the EXAMINER in charge of this application

COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS

ADVISORY ACTION

☐ THE PERIOD FOR RESPONSE:

- a) ☐ is extended to run _____ or continues to run _____ from the date of the final rejection
- b) ☐ expires three months from the date of the final rejection or as of the mailing date of this Advisory Action, whichever is later. In no event however, will the statutory period for the response expire later than six months from the date of the final rejection.

Any extension of time must be obtained by filing a petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a), the proposed response and the appropriate fee. The date on which the response, the petition, and the fee have been filed is the date of the response and also the date for the purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. Any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.17 will be calculated from the date of the originally set shortened statutory period for response or as set forth in b) above.

☒ Appellant's Brief is due in accordance with 37 CFR 1.192(a).

☒ Applicant's response to the final rejection, filed 10-5-94 has been considered with the following effect, but it is not deemed to place the application in condition for allowance:

1. ☐ The proposed amendments to the claim and/or specification will not be entered and the final rejection stands because:
- ☐ There is no convincing showing under 37 CFR 1.116(b) why the proposed amendment is necessary and was not earlier presented.
 - ☐ They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search. (See Note).
 - ☐ They raise the issue of new matter. (See Note).
 - ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal.
 - ☐ They present additional claims without cancelling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE:

2. ☒ Newly proposed or amended claims 9 and 35 would be allowed if submitted in a separately filed amendment cancelling the non-allowable claims.

3. ☒ Upon the filing an appeal, the proposed amendment ☒ will be entered ☐ will not be entered and the status of the claims will be as follows:

Claims allowed: 7-9, 14, 15 and 35

Claims objected to: none

Claims rejected: 6, 13, 16-19 and 26-33

However:

☒ Applicant's response has overcome the following rejection(s): The rejection set forth in Paragraph 5
is withdrawn

4. ☒ The affidavit, exhibit or request for reconsideration has been considered but does not overcome the rejection because the claims no longer read upon inspection species it would still require undue experimentation to determine which were active for the response measured disclosed, which reasons have not been adequately explained by applicant. See also, Ex parte Maitzel, 27 USPQ2d 1662 (1991, 1993) which requires an adequate explanation of the proposed amendment. Claims are not deemed to overcome the "Dunkley" rejection.
5. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will not be considered because applicant has not shown good and sufficient reasons why it was not earlier presented.

☐ The proposed drawing correction ☐ has ☐ has not been approved by the examiner.

☒ Other Applicants are correct and thankful for noting that the omission of claim 28 from the scope rejection was an inadvertent omission in it was, in fact, a typographical error as can be seen from the fact that the scope rejection refers to in the other claims of the kind.
The formal drawing was not rejected for the
PTOL-303 (REV. 5-89) 11/08/94 11/08/94 11/08/94

KEITH C. FURMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER
KEITH C. FURMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER